

FEB 2 1927

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XX, No. 14

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1927

WHOLE No. 544

## *Attractive Supplementary Reading*

### **JULIA: A Latin Reading Book**

By MAUD REED

A collection of carefully selected tales of Ancient Greece and Rome adaptable to first-year classes that make the study of Latin interesting from the very beginning. The selections are well graded in vocabulary and con-

structions, and the book increases in difficulty with each of the stories. "The appeal of the stories and the easy arrangement of the material make it a book which cannot be excelled as a text for beginning Latin classes". \$.48

### **CAMILLA: A Latin Reading Book**

By MAUD REED

This beginning reading book is a companion to the author's *JULIA: A Latin Reading Book*, and like its predecessor is made up of classical stories retold. *CAMILLA* is made up of eight charming simple stories of Roman life and mythology. Throughout, the style

has been kept extremely simple and the constructions restricted to those met in the second semester. With *JULIA*, this little book forms a helpful and interesting stepping-stone on the way to the reading of classical authors. \$.48

*Send for our booklet on Books in Ancient Languages for Secondary Schools*

## **THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

NEW YORK  
BOSTON

CHICAGO  
DALLAS

ATLANTA  
SAN FRANCISCO

**T**HERE are two important innovations in PLACE'S  
**SECOND YEAR LATIN**,---the Introductory Lessons and the Training Camp.

The Lessons lay stress on the syntactical principles not covered in first-year Latin work and which the student needs to know for the reading of Caesar.

The Training Camp provides an intensive study of the first twenty chapters of Caesar's Gallic War. This work develops in the pupil a dynamic power to progress rapidly and confidently.

**PLACE'S SECOND YEAR LATIN**  
596 pp. Illustrated. \$1.68

---

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

NEW YORK    CINCINNATI    CHICAGO    BOSTON    ATLANTA

*D'Ooge's*  
**CONCISE LATIN GRAMMAR**

**DR. D'OUGE** has written a Latin Grammar which includes all the principles needed for the study of Latin classics in High School and College, and omits all non-essential points. The examples illustrating forms and constructions are taken from the portions of Caesar, Cicero, and Virgil which are usually read in Secondary Schools.

**FEATURES** which add great interest and value to the text are a brief history of the Latin tongue, a discussion of the formation of words, a few paragraphs on Roman names, and a full treatment of the Roman calendar. Catalogue price, \$1.48.

**GINN AND COMPANY**

*Boston                      New York                      Chicago                      Atlanta*  
*Dallas                      Columbus                      San Francisco*

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XX, No. 14

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1927

WHOLE NO. 544

## PLATO'S APOLOGY AND XENOPHON'S APOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

It is probable that very few of the readers of Plato's Apology read Xenophon's brief composition of the same name. This is perhaps to be expected in view of the disparity between the two pieces in respect to literary charm and dignity. It seems likely, however, that many who read Plato's report of Socrates's defence never even become aware of the fact that another report is in existence. Indeed, the majority of our School editions of Plato's Apology do not so much as mention the Xenophontic piece. This complete disregard of it can hardly be excused. It would seem that at least a knowledge of the existence of Xenophon's Apology and an acquaintance with the chief discrepancies between it and Plato's Apology would be desirable for all who read the latter composition.

The comparative neglect in recent times of Xenophon's Apology is partially to be explained, without question, by the doubts concerning its genuineness which were current during the nineteenth century. The following quotation from the Introduction to Jowett's translation of Plato's Apology is representative of the position taken by many scholars of that period: "...The parallelisms which occur in the so-called Apology of Xenophon are not worth noticing, because the writing in which they are contained is manifestly spurious. ..."

It was not, indeed, until the latter part of the eighteenth century that the genuineness of the piece was questioned<sup>2</sup>. Thereafter its rejection became common, though the Xenophontic authorship was championed by not a few of the most distinguished scholars of the nineteenth century. The last important attack upon its genuineness was that of von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf in 1897<sup>3</sup>. Since the beginning of the present century the prevailing attitude with regard to this, as with regard to many other works the genuineness of which had previously been questioned, has been definitely in favor of the acceptance of the traditional authorship. In 1900 Otto Immisch published an elaborate and convincing vindication of the Xenophontic character of its language and style<sup>4</sup>. I think it may be said without fear of contradiction that to-day there is not only fairly complete agreement as to the authenticity of the piece, but also a distinct tendency to emphasize its importance as a historical source.

Much of the criticism that has been directed against the piece has been based upon the claim that in one way or another it is unworthy of Xenophon. It is indeed true that its very brevity—it is less than one quarter as long as Plato's Apology—gives it an effect of meagerness and robs it of the usual charm of Xenophon's writings. Yet a scholar with so fine a feeling for style as Mahaffy speaks of it as "neatly and even elegantly written in the unmistakable vein of Socratic questioning"<sup>5</sup>. It should be remembered, in judging the composition, that it was, to quote Mahaffy<sup>6</sup> again, "like the fourth Gospel, a sort of supplement to the incompleteness of other defences", and that it purposely stressed one particular aspect of the subject. It must be admitted that it succeeds adequately in accomplishing what it sets out to do. Furthermore, it is very questionable whether the picture of Socrates which is given here is any more disappointing than that which we derive from Xenophon's other writings.

The chief stumbling-block for many in the way of accepting the piece has been the fact that it contradicts Plato's Apology in several important particulars. But the discrepancies between the two compositions, serious as they are, can scarcely be regarded as of themselves affording certain proof that one or the other is a forgery. In view of the positive evidence for the genuineness of both, it is clear that a less facile explanation of these disagreements must be sought.

It is my purpose in this paper simply to discuss the more striking discrepancies between the two Apologies. No attempt will be made to give a complete presentation of the points of similarity and difference; and the interesting questions of their relationship in date and purpose<sup>7</sup>, as well as that of the relationship between Xenophon's Apology and his *Memorabilia*, lie outside the scope of the discussion. Before I proceed, however, to take up the individual points of variance I wish to call attention to certain general considerations.

In the first place, it must be remembered that the two Apologies differ considerably in character. The Platonic composition professes to be a report, complete but without comment by the reporter, of the three speeches delivered by Socrates at his trial. Xenophon's is a description of Socrates's conduct before, during, and after the trial, in the course of which is reported what is confessedly (22) only a small portion of what Socrates said.

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Twentieth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the University of Pennsylvania, April 30-May 1, 1926.

<sup>2</sup>Doubt concerning its genuineness was first expressed, apparently, by Valckenae, in his note on Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1. 1, in Ernesti's fifth edition of that work (Leipzig, 1772). The Apology is included in the list of Xenophon's works given by Diogenes Laertius (2. 57), a list evidently derived from Demetrius of Magnesia, and consequently dating back to the first century B. C.

<sup>3</sup>In *Hermes* 32, 99-106.

<sup>4</sup>In *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum* 5, 405-415.

<sup>5</sup>J. P. Mahaffy, *Greek Classical Literature*, 2. 2. 62 (London, Macmillan, 1890).

<sup>6</sup>2. 2. 61.

<sup>7</sup>The view that Xenophon wrote his Apology to correct and complete Plato's, or at any rate that Plato was one of the predecessors to whom he refers, has been widely held. The priority of Xenophon's report, however, has had its champions, notably M. Wetzels, in *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum* 5 (1900), 389-405.

In the second place, Xenophon's report is avowedly second-hand, and we have therefore to make allowance for the possibility that the writer misunderstood his informant. Xenophon, not having been present at the trial himself, quotes Hermogenes as his authority for the statements he makes. Hermogenes was an indigent younger brother of Callias, the wealthy patron of Sophists, and was named by Xenophon in the *Memorabilia* (1. 2. 48; compare 2. 10. 3-6) as one of that group of intimate associates of Socrates whose high aim in consorting with him was development of character. We have, therefore, allowing for misunderstandings on Xenophon's part, to match the testimony of this Hermogenes against that of Plato. It has been suggested that the acquaintance with Hermogenes which we gain from Plato's *Cratylus* and Xenophon's *Symposium* is not such as to inspire us with confidence in him as an interpreter of Socrates's motives. In the *Cratylus* he is Socrates's interlocutor for the greater part of the dialogue, and in Xenophon's *Symposium* remarks of his are quoted on several occasions (3. 8-9, 14; 4. 23, 46-49; 6. 1-4; 8. 3-12). Professor Burnet says<sup>8</sup> that he "does not impress us as a man of much discernment". The characterization in the *Cratylus*, however, is not sufficiently vivid, it seems to me, to permit any inferences to be drawn from it; all that could be asserted of the silent, grave, serious-minded man depicted in Xenophon's *Symposium* is that he might take too literally things that he heard people say. Indeed, it would seem probable that as a reporter of mere facts he would be eminently reliable.

It should be noted, further, that the view that Plato's *Apology* was not designed to be an accurate report of the words used by Socrates at his trial is one which has gained very wide acceptance. It is a view, indeed, of venerable antiquity, going back at least to Aelius Aristides (*Oratio* 49, page 518 in Dindorf's edition), to a passage written about 160 A. D. According to the *Ars Rhetorica* 8. 8 (often ascribed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, but now thought to belong to the third century A. D.), Plato's composition was designed to serve not only as an *'Απολογία* in the strict sense of the term, but also as an *'Αθηναίων Κατηγορία*, a *Σωκράτους Ἐγκώμιον*, and a *Παράγγελμα ὁποῖον εἶναι δεῖ τὸν φιλόσοφον*. In other words, Plato wished to present not only a defence of Socrates against the charges which had been brought against him, but also an arraignment of the Athenian populace which had put Socrates to death, a eulogy of the master, and a portrait of the ideal sage. Such supplementary motives, with varying emphasis upon them, have been quite commonly ascribed to Plato in more recent times. If we accept this widespread view that Plato's *Apology* was a 'Tendenzschrift', that in writing it he was actuated by other motives than that of giving an accurate report of Socrates's words, we have to admit that there was of necessity a certain amount of deliberate inaccuracy in his report, and that the extent to which he allowed himself to introduce such inaccuracy is purely a matter of speculation.

Again, the question as to the relative historical value of the two *Apologies* is bound up to a certain extent with the whole problem—a perennial 'Streitfrage' of classical scholarship—of the relative reliability of the Socratic works of Xenophon and the Platonic dialogues as sources of knowledge concerning the historical Socrates. One's answer to the specific question will be colored in some degree by one's general view as to how far Plato has idealized Socrates even in his earliest dialogues, and as to how far Xenophon failed, by reason of the limitations of his nature, to appreciate the true significance of Socrates's activity. On the other hand, of course, it is obvious that these two compositions, inasmuch as they deal with a well-known historical occurrence and are less concerned than other Socratic works with philosophical speculations or the subtleties of dialectic, can to a greater extent than the others be considered independently of the larger problem.

Proceeding to a consideration of the discrepancies between the two reports, we find that an apparent discrepancy is presented at once by the chief contention of the Xenophontic piece. The opening passage of the latter is as follows:

'It seems worth while to put on record the view which Socrates took regarding both his defence and his death after he had been cited to appear in court. Others, to be sure, have written on this topic, and all have hit off his boastful tone <μεγαληγορία>, a fact which makes it clear that Socrates did actually adopt this tone in addressing the jury. But one point they have not brought out clearly, that he had come to regard death as preferable for himself to life, and consequently his boastful tone is made to seem rather foolish'.

Xenophon goes on to say that Hermogenes gave a report of the matter which made Socrates's *μεγαληγορία* seem entirely consonant with his intentions. For when Hermogenes had expressed to Socrates his surprise at the latter's apparent lack of concern regarding his trial, Socrates, after asserting that his whole life had been the finest possible preparation for his defence in that he had consistently done nothing wrong, declared that on two occasions the *δαίμόνιον* had opposed him when he essayed to consider his defence. His explanation of this fact was that God out of his kindness was providing him with the means of bringing his life to a close at an opportune moment, before his powers began to fail and the ills of old age increased upon him, and of doing so by the least objectionable mode of death known.

No reader of Plato's *Apology* could deny, I am sure, that there is reflected in it to a considerable extent that boastful tone to which Xenophon refers. Perhaps the most striking passage is that (30 A-C) in which Socrates asserts, 'I believe that no greater good has ever come to pass in the city than my service to God', and defies the citizens of Athens with the threat that, whether they acquit him or not, he will not alter his conduct even if he is to die many times over. But this is only one of many such passages. To be sure, Plato makes Socrates twice (34 D, 37 A) disclaim any attitude of contumacy (*αὐθαδέϊσθαι*), and there is nothing to indicate that he went out of his way to

<sup>8</sup>J. Burnet, *Plato's Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates, and Crito*, 65 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1924).



irritate his judges. He clearly, however, made no effort to accommodate his words to the sensibilities of his auditors. If the tone of his words as quoted by Xenophon impresses us as more arrogant still, it is simply due to the fact, I think, that the flavor of irony which we find so constantly in Plato is lacking.

How far, then, was Xenophon correct in attributing Socrates's manner of addressing the jury to his belief that death was preferable for himself to life? To begin with, I feel sure that we caricature Xenophon's thought if we say that he represents Socrates as deliberately provoking the jury for the purpose of getting himself condemned to death. In reiterating his main contention near the end of the Apology (32) Xenophon uses these words:

'Socrates by his selflaudation <διὰ τὸ μεγαλύνει ἑαυτόν> in court aroused a feeling of bitterness against himself and thereby made his conviction by the jury all the more inevitable'.

There is no suggestion of deliberate provocation of the jury. Indeed, we find stated here, it seems to me, exactly the impression we derive from Plato's Apology. The notable tribute which Xenophon pays in the Memorabilia (4. 4. 4) to the moral strength exhibited by Socrates in his trial shows that he recognized clearly that Socrates's procedure was no cowardly flight from the ills of old age. Furthermore, an attentive perusal of the conversation between Socrates and Hermogenes, as reported by Xenophon in the Apology (2-9), makes it clear that Socrates's chief wish was to avoid servility of demeanor toward his judges. He declares that he will prefer death to gaining the far less desirable boon of life by begging for it in servile fashion (*ἀνελευθέριος*), with which we may compare the statement (38 E) of the Platonic Socrates that he did not think he ought to do anything *ἀνελευθέριον*. In other words, Socrates refused to conciliate the judges or to conduct himself in a way that would diminish his selfrespect. The thought of the possible impending infirmities and distresses of old age reconciled him to the probable result.

There is nothing in this view, I think, essentially inconsistent with the report of Socrates's words which Plato gives. In fact, Plato makes him distinctly say (41 D), 'I see plainly that it was better for me to die now and be freed from troubles'. Professor Burnet argues (66)

that there was no reason why Socrates should not have looked forward to at least another ten years of activity and that, from all we know of his character, he would not have felt free to abandon the mission imposed on him by God unless he believed that God himself had released him.

But it would seem that even a person with as hardy a constitution as his might look forward to the time of life beyond three score years and ten with some questionings, and would think it likely that his vision would become less perfect, his hearing less keen, his mind less alert, and his memory less retentive, as Socrates is represented as forecasting to Hermogenes (6). According to this same report he did very emphatically believe that "God himself had released him", with the result that he did feel free "to abandon the mission imposed on him by God". He interpreted the two-

fold interposition of the *δαίμωνιον* when he undertook to prepare a defence as a sign that God was now offering him release, as he declared thrice over (5, 7, 8). It seems to me highly probable, therefore, that Socrates did welcome his condemnation (which he regarded as certain if he refused to adopt a servile attitude toward the jury) as an opportunity to avoid possible deterioration of his faculties through old age and that he did give expression to this thought in an attempt to reconcile his friends to his determination not to cajole his judges.

One of the most puzzling contradictions between the two Apologies has to do with the wording of the oracle delivered in response to Chaerephon's inquiry. Whereas Plato (21 A) reports the oracle as having declared that no one was wiser than Socrates, Xenophon (i. e. Hermogenes) reports it (14) as having declared that no one was more free, more just, or more sensible<sup>9</sup>. The elaborate account in Plato's Apology of the activities of Socrates stimulated by the response of the oracle might suggest that the more correct form was reported there; it is possible, however, that Plato made Socrates quote only that part of the oracular response which was germane to his argument, the particular declaration, that is, which induced him to set out upon investigations rendering him obnoxious to various persons. Xenophon would have no motive for emphasizing one special part of the response, for he gives no indication that the oracle served as a stimulus to investigations on Socrates's part. Plato's neglect of the other elements in the response was perhaps prompted also by his tendency to lay emphasis upon the intellectual aspect of Socrates's activity to the neglect of other aspects.

Another strange contradiction is involved in Socrates's reply to Meletus's charge of having persuaded young men to listen to himself instead of to their parents (Xenophon, Apology 20-21). Socrates admits this, but justifies himself on the ground that he is an expert in education, the greatest blessing men possess. He protests against being prosecuted on a capital charge because of the offence of being rated by some as the leading expert in this most important field; and he contrasts his own experience with that of experts in other fields, upon whom special honors are bestowed. The evidence of Plato, however, not only in the Apology but elsewhere, is that Socrates repudiated the notion that the relationship between himself and the young men who sought association with him was that of teacher and pupils; he was unwilling to be classed with the Sophists, not only because they made money out of teaching, but also because they claimed to be able to impart knowledge the possession of which he himself, with characteristic *αἰρωνία*, disclaimed. This point of view is reflected also in Xenophon's

<sup>9</sup>That the word *σωφρονέστερον* in 14 has this shade of meaning rather than that of 'selfcontrolled' is indicated by the use of *σοφόν* in the comment (in 16) upon this item of the response. It is possible that *σωφρονέστερον* of 14 is a slip for *σοφώτερον*. On the other hand, it is perhaps more likely that Plato's *σοφώτερον*—like the *σοφόν* of Xenophon's comment—simply reflects the interpretation put upon the actual wording of the oracle by those who studied its meaning.

Memorabilia 1. 2. 3, where it is expressly stated that Socrates never professed to be a *διδάσκαλος* of *καλοκάγαθια*, though there are other passages in the same work which, in effect, contradict this statement<sup>10</sup>. The explanation seems to be that, in spite of Socrates's disclaimer of the name of teacher, it was readily recognized by those about him that he, if any one, with his profound wisdom and his great influence over young men, deserved to be exalted on the score of competence in *παιδεία*. In this instance we may suppose that Hermogenes (or possibly Xenophon) put into the mouth of Socrates, in answer to Meletus's charge, the defence which it was felt he would have had every right to make, instead of the one which he did actually make. It may be added that it is not impossible that Plato, by reason of his antagonism to the Sophists, stressed Socrates's repudiation of the popular conception of himself as an educator more strongly than was really warranted by Socrates's own utterances.

The most striking contradiction of all has reference to the proposal of a counter-penalty. Xenophon states (23) that Socrates refused to propose or to allow his friends to propose for him any counter-penalty, on the ground that such a proposal implied an acknowledgment of guilt. The view that this account is historically correct, as against Plato's representation (38 B) that Socrates ultimately proposed the payment of a fine, has gained wide acceptance of late, especially in Germany. Schanz's explanation of the discrepancy is as follows<sup>11</sup>. After the death of Socrates it was claimed that, if he had proposed the payment of a fine, he would, in all probability, have escaped the death penalty; and his friends were criticized for not having rallied to his support to save him by financial sacrifices on their part. Plato desired, in answer to these charges, to make it clear that the friends of Socrates would gladly have supplied the money, but that the feeling against Socrates was so bitter and the eagerness for his death so intense that the proposal of a fine would not have been accepted. Plato, therefore, in order to justify himself and his friends, resorted to the expedient of reporting what might have happened instead of what did happen. Socrates, who actually refused, on the grounds indicated by Xenophon, to propose a counter-penalty, was represented as in the end proposing a considerable fine at the bidding of a group of friends and as naming Plato himself and three others as sureties for the payment. Plato, according to this theory of Schanz, did not expect his report to be taken as a recital of fact; he meant it to be understood for what it was, a vindication of himself and his friends. The Athenians of his own day, having been present at the trial, would know what had occurred and would recognize that he had a definite motive in giving a fictitious account of the episode; non-Athenian readers and those of later generations would find a clue to the correct interpretation of the account in the inconsequent manner in which the passage containing the proposal of the payment of the fine is appended

to the remainder of the speech. This ingenious theory is to my mind not altogether convincing. Professor Burnet insists (160), rightly, I think, that there would have been no inconsistency in Socrates's proposing a small fine, for a fine is not an evil unless it is so large that it cannot be paid and therefore involves imprisonment, which, like exile, is an evil. It seems to me that the most reasonable explanation of the contradiction between the two reports is that Xenophon simply misunderstood Hermogenes. The latter, we may suppose, while telling Xenophon that an offer to pay a fine had been made by Socrates's friends, repeated also some such statement as that which Plato records (37 B):

'Since I am convinced that I am not guilty of wronging any human being, I am certainly not going to be guilty of wronging myself and say of myself that I deserve anything bad, and propose any such penalty for myself'.

Such a statement might easily have led Xenophon to assume that the offer was rejected by Socrates instead of by the jury (as Hermogenes intended him to understand). I think it easier to suppose that such a misunderstanding occurred than that Plato with some subtle motive—so subtle, indeed, that it was never suspected, as far as is known, until late in the nineteenth century—misrepresented the facts relating to such an outstanding incident in the trial.

Certain other discrepancies may be referred to more briefly.

Xenophon (11) represents Socrates as appealing to the common knowledge of his fellowcitizens in proof of his scrupulous observance of established religious practices and as arguing definitely against the charge of innovation in religious matters (12-13)<sup>12</sup>. In Plato, on the other hand, there is nothing of all this. Socrates, to be sure, elaborately vindicates himself on the score of atheism in a semiserious tilt against Meletus (26 B-28 A), but he is silent regarding the real charge of religious innovation. We may suppose that a man of Xenophon's conservative temperament and superficial acquaintance with Socrates<sup>13</sup> would be impressed by the external conformity of his religious acts; while Plato, who saw deeper, would emphasize in his own thoughts the singularly lofty, and for that age genuinely radical, conception of the gods and their worship which underlay Socrates's conventional observances. In writing of Socrates, therefore, both Xenophon and Plato tended to stress that side of his religion which made the greatest impression upon them. Plato, realizing that he could not present Socrates's religious views without bringing out their essentially revolutionary character, contented himself, as Socrates may well have done in his actual speech to the jury, with playfully setting up and demolishing the suggestion that Socrates was an atheist.

With regard to the character of Socrates's divine

<sup>10</sup>See Book 4, *passim*, especially 4. 7. 1-2, where the word *διδάσκει* is twice used of Socrates. Compare also 1. 2. 17, 31.

<sup>11</sup>M. Schanz, *Plato, Apologia*, 98-99 (Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1893).

<sup>12</sup>He likewise makes much in the *Memorabilia* of the correctness of Socrates's religious observances (see 1. 1. 2, 20; 1. 3. 1-3). The argument against the charge of religious innovation is also elaborated (1. 1. 3-9).

<sup>13</sup>It is noteworthy that Plato never mentions Xenophon and that there is no evidence that Xenophon was ever really intimate with Socrates.

voice or sign the two writers are not in accord. Plato (31 D) makes Socrates say that it served only as a restraint upon him and never prompted him to action. Xenophon, however, evidently thought of it as telling him what to do as well as what not to do; we see this both in the *Apology* (12) and, more clearly still, in the *Memorabilia* (1. 1. 4), where Socrates is said to have made a practice of advising his associates in accordance with the guidance given to himself. Without going into the intricate questions suggested by the various references to this phenomenon and the various terms used of it in Plato and in Xenophon, we may accept the general proposition that Plato, because of his presumably greater intimacy with Socrates and more penetrating insight into his personality, would be more likely to have precise knowledge about the matter. As there would be nothing, apparently, to color his conception of it or to cause him to distort the facts concerning it, we may readily accept his testimony here.

A problem is raised by Xenophon's mention of persons to whom he refers (22) as *οἱ συναγορεύοντες φίλοι αὐτοῦ*. As Plato's *Apology* seems to preclude the supposition that Socrates had *συνήγοροι* in the ordinary sense to speak on his behalf, it has been suggested that the persons mentioned by Xenophon were rather of the nature of witnesses, such as the fathers and brothers of Socrates's associates who are spoken of in Plato's *Apology* (34 A) as ready to come to his support. It is difficult, however, in view of the term used by Xenophon, to dismiss the notion that he believed that speeches had been made on Socrates's behalf.

Xenophon, in quoting the indictment against Socrates (10), follows very closely what we know on the authority of Favorinus (in *Diogenes Laertius* 2. 40) to have been the official formulation of it. Plato, however, represents Socrates as quoting it from memory and as altering the order in which the counts of the indictment are given (24 B). Much stress has been laid by some scholars<sup>14</sup> upon this alteration of the order, which presumably was intentional. A sufficient motive, however, would be the desire to emphasize the fact that the charge of corrupting the youth was the really serious item in the accusation.

Finally, it may be noted that, while both Plato and Xenophon make Socrates refer to the belief that men prophesy at the approach of death, in Plato (39 C) this reference occurs in Socrates's speech after the sentence and prefaces a forecast of punishment for those who have voted for his condemnation, while in Xenophon (30) it occurs in what is clearly a private conversation with friends and introduces a prediction that Anytus's son will turn out badly. Also, both writers make Socrates refer to Palamedes in the speech after the sentence; but in Plato's *Apology* (41 A, B) Socrates is telling of the pleasure it will be to him to meet in the underworld famous persons who have been put to death unjustly, while in Xenophon's (26) he cites the fair fame which came to Palamedes after his death as an indication of the high esteem in which he himself will be held in after times.

In conclusion, two remarks of a more general nature may be added.

In the first place, Xenophon's *Apology* fully bears out the impression given by Plato that the defence Socrates made to the jury was not the defence of a man who considered acquittal a thing of prime importance. That any defendant should not consider acquittal a thing of prime importance can scarcely have entered the minds of the majority of Socrates's hearers; and his manner, we can be quite sure, seemed to them just what Xenophon calls it—*ἀφρονεστέρις*, 'rather foolish'.

In the second place, the differences in tone between the two *Apologies* are such that, if Hermogenes and Xenophon have given a report of Socrates's words which, so far as it goes, is fairly accurate, then Plato has given a report in which not only the specific arguments but Socrates's whole manner of speech are deliberately idealized. The superiority of Xenophon's report in the matter of historical accuracy cannot, of course, be proved. Even if it could be, however, men would continue to read Plato's report in preference to it. For Plato, whether or not he has preserved for us Socrates's actual defence, has given us the defence which we should all wish Socrates to have made.

SAINT STEPHEN'S COLLEGE,  
ANNANDALE-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK

L. R. SHERO

#### AENEID 1.161

Aeneid 1.159-161 runs as follows:

Est in secessu longo locus: insula portum  
efficit objectu laterum, quibus omnis ab alto  
frangitur inque sinus scindit sese unda reductos.

Most commentators seem to regard the words *sinus...reductos* (161) as describing the action of waves which break and then rush onward into deep clefts in the rocks. But waves breaking on a level beach present an aspect which might well attract the eye of an observant and musing poet; and if the perfect phrase to describe that aspect was then born in his mind, it might linger there, to be used when occasion arose, without too strict insistence on its immediate appropriateness.

At any rate, a sea-side walk will demonstrate how the breaking wave runs up the beach in a sheet of water, how this sheet does not have a continuous margin, but parts (*scindit se*) into scallops (*sinus*), which presently withdraw (*reductos*) to the level from which they were flung. Might not all this seem to a poet more beautiful, and perhaps less obvious, than the more noticeable boiling of surf among cleft rocks?

It is true that in *Georgics* 4.420 the same words occur (with the substitution of *cogitur* for *frangitur*), and that there Vergil makes the sea break into a cave (*specus*, 418)<sup>1</sup>. But this cave is the retreat of Proteus, where he sleeps like a basking seal on coming out of the water (*ab undis*, 403). The same cave is also a refuge for sailors caught by a tempest (421). It might easily, therefore, have had a strip of sand in front of it, or even within. Finally, let us remember that the shipwreck described in Aeneid 1 happened on a sandy shore (107, 111-112, 172).

Heyne appears to favor for Aeneid 1.161 the interpretation I have given. His note reads: "Sinuoso flexu fluctus recedunt; sese in sinus reductos vol-

<sup>1</sup>Verses 418-420 run thus: Est specus ingens exesi latere in montis, quo plurima vento cogitur inque sinus scindit sese unda reductos....

<sup>14</sup>E. g. by Schanz, 81.



vunt.... Solent enim fluctus allisi longo tractu retrorsum acti dissolvi"<sup>2</sup>.

It seems to me that our passage is like the *amica silentia lunae* of Aeneid 2.255, which editors have so tortured in the attempt to make *amica* and *silentia* fit the context. But if the words came to Vergil while he watched the Bay of Naples as it lay, hushed and glassy, under a summer moon, need we complain if he uses them here for their sheer beauty and magic? Vergil's "lonely words"<sup>3</sup> would never have flowered with "all the charm of all the Muses" had he been forced to prune them into prim submission to the plans of a formal Italian garden of verse.

Could, then, the picture in Vergil's mind have been something like this?

'There is a haven in a lonely bay;  
For there an island stretches out her shores,  
On which the high surf plunges, and the wave  
Parts into rushing sheets of scallopy foam,  
That halt and are drawn backward to the sea'.

THE LOOMIS INSTITUTE,  
WINDSOR, CONNECTICUT

J. E. BARSS

### REVIEWS

Hellenistic Philosophies. By Paul Elmer More. Princeton University Press (1923). Pp. 385.

Under the title Hellenistic Philosophies, in the third volume of the series<sup>1</sup> he is writing to set forth the Greek Tradition as it developed from Socrates to the Christian Fathers, Mr. Paul Elmer More has published seven essays which will please and enlighten any one who reads them. The several Hellenistic systems are presented as attempts to rationalize the dualistic inconsistencies which seem to inhere in the nature of things, and as strivings toward selfsufficiency (*αὐτάρκεια*), i. e. the soul's security and liberty. They are all imperfectly Socratic in that they combine rationalism with only a part of the threefold Socratic teaching: Epicureans and Stoics rationalized the thesis that virtue is knowledge, Sceptics (Pyrrhonists) took the thesis of scepticism and joined it with hedonism, Neoplatonists rationalized the spiritual affirmation.

The exposition of the doctrines of Neoplatonism is clear and sympathetic, but, when Mr. More's interpretation of Platonism is understood and his admiration of it is realized, we know that he must hold that Plotinus's central doctrine is not truly Platonic; and

<sup>1</sup>But on Georgics 4.420 Heynē takes a different view. He writes thus: "...postquam <unda specum> intravit, in plures sinus, h. <e.> cavitates antri et recessus dissipavit se, adeoque, scindit sese. Ita malim interpretari, quia de specu agitur. Alioquin non damnum illam rationem, ex qua sinus reducti fluctuum, allisorum scopulis, et longo tractu recedentium, cavitate intus relicta, intelliguntur".

A view somewhat akin to that advocated by Mr. Barss has been presented, says Conington (on Aeneid 1.161), by Wagner, Forbiger, Gossrau, and Henry. Henry devotes nearly twelve pages to the matter (1.444-455). He interprets *sinus* of "the vertical sinuosity of the sea, i. e. the sinuosity of the sea's surface as contradistinguished from the sinuosity of the sea's edge...at its mean. In the picture<s> presented 1.109...and 3.564...and Georg. 3.237...the same sinuosity is at its maximum..."

None the less Mr. Barss's note is worth printing, partly because he looks at the matter differently from the way in which Henry views it (and better, I think), partly because every note born, as was this note, of actual observation of the phenomena which a poet had, actually or conceivably, in mind is well worth printing. In this connection I would remind readers again of Miss Mary E. Campbell's paper, Aeneid 8.96, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18, 132-134. See especially 134, note 5. C. K. >.

<sup>2</sup>On Vergil's "lonely words" see Professor A. L. Keith, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14, 36-37. C. K. >.

<sup>3</sup>For a review, by Professor Edward Fitch, of another volume in the series, The Religion of Plato, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16, 86-88. C. K. >.

with evident regret he expresses his conviction that "mysticism of the Plotinian type is almost certain evidence of a physical or mental or moral taint somewhere in the devotee". The discussion of scepticism is also attractive. In the course of it some heavy blows are dealt to scientists turned metaphysicians: our author esteems the ancient sceptics more highly than many modern critics esteem them, and he attributes to them keener insight and greater consistency than he ascribes to many modern agnostics.

Not only were the later systems of Hellenism largely devoted to the practical philosophy, but it seems also that Mr. More's interest runs strongly toward philosophy as the guide of life, the liberator of the soul. His ability as a writer of philosophical essays is finely exhibited in this book, which one reads with delight and closes with a sort of regretful satisfaction.

TRINITY COLLEGE,  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

LEROY C. BARRET

Greek Ethical Thought. By Hilda D. Oakeley. London: J. M. Dent and Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company (1925). Pp. xlii + 226.

Miss Oakeley's book, Greek Ethical Thought, one of the volumes of The Library of Greek Thought<sup>1</sup>, presents in English a collection of quotations ranging from Homer to the Stoics. More than one-half of the space is devoted to quotations from Plato and Aristotle: these will acquaint the general reader with some typical Greek expressions of ethical thought. There is an Introduction setting forth the progress of Greek ethical thought from the primitive notion of conduct dominated by some blind force to the high conception of the Good as a heavenly vision to which man must not be disobedient. This book will answer adequately the call which brought it and other volumes of its series into existence; one who is studying Greek will refer to it only occasionally.

TRINITY COLLEGE,  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

LEROY C. BARRET

An Outline of Ancient History to A. D. 180. By Mary Agnes Hamilton and A. W. F. Blunt. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch (1924). Pp. lv + 193.

The reprint of Mrs. Hamilton's Outlines of Greek and Roman History to A. D. 180 (Oxford University Press, 1923), with the addition of an opening section by Mr. Blunt on The Ancient East, provides a very useful synopsis of the history of the ancient world from the beginnings in Mesopotamia to the death of Marcus Aurelius. Its existence, in a field already occupied by books such as those of Breasted, Myres, Westermann, Botsford, and Webster, is justified not merely by its relative brevity, but by its assured usefulness in the class-room. The authors have had clearly in mind the needs of students in Secondary

<sup>1</sup>Other volumes of this Library have been reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, as follows: M. L. W. Laistner, Greek Economics, reviewed by W. L. Westermann, 17, 144; A. J. Toynbee, Greek Historical Thought from Homer to the Age of Heraclius, reviewed by W. K. Prentice, 19, 213-214; A. J. Toynbee, Greek Civilization and Character: The Self-Revelation of Ancient Greek Society, reviewed by I. M. Linforth, 19, 223-224. C. K. >.



Schools, and by the use of an admirably clear and simple style, by careful arrangement of material and by the insertion of skilfully chosen photographs and maps have produced a very readable volume.

The scope of the material covered may be judged from the table of contents, which follows in simplified form:

Table of Chronology (vi-vii); Part I (chapters on The Babylonian Empire, The Egyptian Empire, The Assyrian Empire, and The Chaldaean and Persian Empires [viii-lv]); Part II (chapters on The Beginnings of Greece, Athens and Sparta, The War with Persia, Athens under Pericles, The Peloponnesian War, The Ascendancy of Sparta, The Ascendancy of Thebes, and Rise of Macedonia, Alexander the Great [9-83]); Part II (chapters on The Beginnings of Rome, Rome and the Gauls, The Samnite Wars, Rome Mistress of Italy, Hannibal, An Empire Overseas, The Gracchi, Marius and Sulla, The Triumvirate, Caesar, The Flavian and Antonine Emperors [85-190]); Index of Proper Names (191-193).

Maps of Italy and Greece decorate the end-papers of the front and back respectively.

The book presents, of course, no new point of view. The conventional statements about ancient history are accepted without question; they are repeated simply, with no change other than the greater condensation required by the size of the volume. The assertion of the South-Russian origin of the Indo-Europeans (xiv) seems to be a compromise between the older theory of Asiatic and the more recent theory of Lithuanian origin<sup>1</sup>. The Assyrians recover from the merciful treatment which they received at the hands of Professor Olmstead. Instead of being merely frank and consistent militarists they become again the familiar scourge which "waged war with a fierce and pitiless cruelty such as the world had never seen" (xli); instead of playing the rôle of the "shepherd dog of civilization" they assume again that of the wolf, and their history and fate "are nothing but a splendid example that they who take the sword shall perish with the sword, and that an empire which has become great only by war will in the end die by war and leave nothing useful behind" (xlvi). One notes, however, with pleasure that the time-honored date for the fall of Nineveh (606 B. C.) is abandoned silently for the date recently established, 612 (xlv). The statement (104) that "Rome respected a brave enemy.... Justice to enemies, fair dealing to friend and foe...—these were the marks of the Romans" is, to say the least, generous; one recalls, uncomfortably, Vercingetorix. The judgement passed on Cicero, "...This eloquence was irresistible both in the law courts and in the assembly. But he never made up his mind firmly about anything, and thus lacked the first quality necessary to a great public man" (146-147), is too harsh. We must keep in mind that our opinion of the vacillation of Cicero derives from his Letters and that we may not in fairness use his intimate personal record to compare him with statesmen known to us only objectively. The speeches

surely show no lack of decision, and Antony in that last heroic year from December 9, 44 to December 7, 43 cannot have been aware of Cicero's inability to make up his mind.

But these are minor faults, inevitable, perhaps, in so condensed a summary. Two more fundamental blemishes must be pointed out. The Hellenistic period is summarily disposed of in two sentences (82): "With Alexander's death, his mighty empire fell to pieces. For the next hundred and fifty years Greek history consists of wars between the different princes who seized parts of his great kingdom". Yet these hundred and fifty years are of infinitely more importance in the history of the Mediterranean World and of far greater interest to the student of Greece and Rome than the thirty years of the Peloponnesian War, which is described (40-58) in two chapters covering a little more than one-fifth of the space allotted to all Greek history. Again, the treatment of the Roman Emperors is, as usual, inadequate. Twenty-eight pages are given to the 211 years from Actium to the death of Marcus Aurelius, twelve to the 16 years of the Hannibalic War. Chapter XII on the Flavian and Antonine Emperors (182-190) is a mere makeshift; Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius are treated no more fully than Caligula, and to the whole period exactly the same space is allotted as is assigned to the fruitless retelling of the early legends of the city.

Despite this lack of proportion, which indeed is a fault common to most of the histories of classical antiquity, even to some far more pretentious in character, the book is decidedly worth while. I have already mentioned the simple and lucid style.

The illustrations are admirable. Several of the photographs are made very suggestive by clever arrangement. The Roman *lilia*, for instance, are illustrated by juxtaposing an ancient and a modern example from the World War (facing page 176). Alexander's route to the East is very effectively illuminated by a photograph of the plain of the Oxus, with an indistinct column of British troops crossing in the foreground (78). Other attractive illustrations will be found on the Frontispiece, and facing pages x, 11, 12, 15, 58, 85, and 177. There are 10 helpful maps, well-chosen and skilfully executed. It is unnecessary to say that this Oxford book is well printed, and that its proofs were carefully read.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE, CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

#### THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB THE CLASSICAL FORUM

The Classical Forum of The New York Classical Club held its first meeting for 1926-1927 in Barnard College, on December 11. The Chairman of The Classical Forum, Professor Rollin H. Tanner, of New York University, presided.

Professor Gonzalez Lodge, of Teachers College, read a stimulating paper on M. Tullius Cicero, Citizen. In this he brought out the lofty motives that actuated Cicero's conduct throughout his entire career: the moral courage that he showed as a young man in venturing to undertake the defence of Roscius, the moral strength that he displayed in resisting the pressure of powerful

<sup>1</sup>See e. g. Harold H. Bender, *The Home of the Indo-Europeans* (Princeton University Press, 1922). <For a review of this book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.63-64. In this review Professor E. H. Sturtevant declines to accept the views of Professor Bender. C. K. >.

'grafters' in connection with the Sicilian grain supply, which led to his being requested by the Sicilians to take charge of the prosecution of Verres, his integrity as proconsul of Cilicia, and his setting aside of personal scruples for the sake of the best interests of the State, in his advocacy of the Manilian Law, and in his defence of Murena. Professor Lodge also defended Cicero against the charge of vacillation, and referred to Cicero's final martyrdom to the cause of patriotism—a patriotism which never failed, but was always in subjection to common sense. Finally, he showed how all Cicero's acts exemplified the four cardinal virtues which he himself discusses in his *De Officiis*—wisdom or knowledge, justice, courage of body and even more of mind, and temperance.

The ensuing Round Table Discussion, dealing with Problems in the Teaching of Cicero, was opened and closed by Dr. Charles A. Tonsor, of Boys' High School, Brooklyn.  
HUNTER COLLEGE

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

### THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME FELLOWSHIPS IN THE SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

The American Academy in Rome announces its annual competitions for the Fellowships in Classical Studies. There is one Fellowship for two years and one Fellowship for one year, each with an annual stipend of \$1,250, with residence in the Academy free of charge. There is opportunity for extensive travel, including a trip to Greece. The competitions are open to unmarried men or women who are citizens of the United States. Applications will be received until March 1.

Persons who desire to compete for one of these Fellowships must fill out a form of application and file it with the Secretary, together with letters of recommendation, not later than March 1. They must submit evidence of attainment in Latin literature, Greek literature, Greek and Roman history and archaeology, and also ability to use German and French. A knowledge of Italian is strongly recommended. They should also submit published or unpublished papers so as to indicate their fitness to undertake special work in Rome.

The Fellows will be selected by a jury of nine eminent scholars without examination other than the submission of the required papers.

For circular and application blank apply to the undersigned, Executive Secretary of the Academy, 101 Park Avenue, New York City.

ROSCOE GUERNSEY

### A PROTEST

May I make an emphatic protest against an interpretation of the opening sentences of the First Oration against Catiline which was recently heard by The New York Classical Club at a meeting of The Classical Forum?

A well-known Brooklyn teacher, taking us into his confidence, gave us to understand that it is his practice to tell his boys that Cicero on that occasion "forgot all his rhetoric and just 'lambasted' Catiline". Immediate objection would probably have been taken, if it were not for the general experience that hardly any two teachers mean precisely the same thing when they use the word *rhetoric*. Very likely the speaker meant little more than that an exordium is wanting, and that elaborate periods and ornate figures are for the moment absent. Yet the literalness of the schoolboy would inevitably lead him to suppose rhetorical form to be entirely lacking, and to compare this 'lambasting' with the murderous-sounding remarks of an Italian laborer abusing his mates.

Let us imagine a teacher of English seeking to stimulate interest by picturing Lincoln on the train to Gettysburg as saying to himself "Rhetoric I may well leave to Everett; for myself, I shall speak from the heart". As if those words from the heart were not fitted together with a perfect mastery of the rhetorical art! To tell a class that Lincoln forgot all his rhetoric, or that Cicero did the same is to use an expression hedged about with mental reservations in the mind of the teacher, but sure to be taken by the pupil at its impossible face value. Why mislead the pupil into the error of supposing that even the spoken form of this speech (to which the published version may bear only a general resemblance) was devoid of rhetoric—the inevitable mould into which the trained speaker can but pour the molten metal of passionate or feeling utterance? If perforce he must 'lambaste', his scourge is sure to be weighted with rhetorical devices mercilessly effective in drawing blood. For was not invective itself an entire chapter of rhetoric?

As some of us conceive it, no task of the Latin teacher is so important as that of showing his pupils how the seasoned reader grasps the meaning of a passage before he ventures upon a connected translation of the whole, and how this first step must be guided by the helps and the warnings which rhetoric gives at every turn. Yet many of our colleagues appear to feel that these devices, however natural in their origin, however valuable as aids to lucid or forceful expression, are to be ignored in the class-room, as if they existed only for mature students—not that they are difficult to explain, but largely because they have strange names, repellent to the real boy or the average girl.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

FRANK GARDNER MOORE

### THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES EIGHTH ANNUAL FALL MEETING

The Eighth Annual Fall Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States was held at the University of Buffalo, on Saturday morning, November 27, 1926. The Fall Meetings of the Association are held in conjunction with the Annual Conventions of The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. The latter organization determines the place of meeting. The time is always the Saturday morning after Thanksgiving.

The weather proved most unpropitious. Warmth and rain prevailed on Friday, snow, cold, and strong wind on Saturday morning. Under the conditions the attendance was good.

The President of the Association, Professor C. W. E. Miller, of The Johns Hopkins University, presided.

The programme was as follows: Reminiscences of Greece, Professor Edward G. Schaubert, University of Buffalo; Some Problems of Syllabus Revision, Mr. Harold G. Thompson, Supervisor, Ancient Languages, The New York State Department of Education; Some Remarks Upon the Aeneid, Professor Charles Knapp, Barnard College.

CHARLES KNAPP

### A CORRECTION

Dr. Joseph Pearl, of the Townsend Harris Hall High School, New York City, kindly informs me that the chaining of a living man to a corpse (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.86) occurs not in a book by Jack London, but in Mr. Frank Norris's novel *McTeague*.

ERNST RIESS